APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,605	07/01/2003	Don W. Coker	3250-0002	6179

73552   7590   12/19/2008
Stolowitz Ford Cowger LLP
621 SW Morrison St
Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205

EXAMINER
SCARITO, JOHN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3696	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 September 2008*.

2a) ☒ This action is FINAL.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-8,10,12,15 and 17* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 10, 12, 15 & 17* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following is Examiner's response to Applicant's amendment received 09/19/2008

stemming from Examiner's Office Action dated 03/20/2008.

Status of the Claims

As per Applicant's response, Examiner acknowledges that Applicant (1) amended Claims

1-8, 10, 12, 15 & 17 and (2) cancelled Claims 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18 & 19. As such, Claims 1-8,

10, 12, 15 & 17 are currently pending. Applicant's state that no new matter has been added and

request reconsideration [Applicant's Response, page 7, line 18].

Response to Remarks/Arguments

Minor Claim Objections

Examiner withdraws his minor claim objections in the Office Action of 03/20/2008 in

view of Applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-5, 10-14 & 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

As per Claims 1-5, 11, 13, 14 & 19, Examiner withdraws his §112-2nd paragraph

rejections in the Office Action of 03/20/2008 in view of Applicant's amendments.

As per Claims 10 & 12, Examiner maintains his §112-2nd paragraph rejections. Examiner

points Applicant to the Office Action of 03/20/2008. [see page 3, line 14—page 4, line

9]. Although Applicant argues that his/her "specification…sufficiently links the means

recited and their function to specific structure" [Applicant's response, page 8, lines 2-4],

Applicant's general reliance on Figure 5 [Applicant's response, page 8, line 4] is

unpersuasive (i.e. Although Figure 5 may show structure, where does Applicant indicate

what structure is performing which functionality?). Examiner also notes Applicant's

incomplete argument which is also deemed unpersuasive. [Applicant's response, page 8,

line 6].

Statutory Grounds of Rejection

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 & 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Josephson

[2003/0213841].

Examiner notes Applicant's attempt to distinguish Josephson ('841) by pointing out that

Josephson ('841) mechanically pre-prints checks with verifying information in lieu of a

manual means of providing verifying information (i.e. payor handwrites the verifying

information on the check). [see Applicant's Response, page 8, lines 17-18]. Examiner

finds this unpersuasive in view of the rejection that follows which was necessitated by

Applicant's amended claim language.

Lastly, Examiner was unable to find support in Applicant's cited portion (i.e. paragraphs

31-35) for identifying information being "encoded on the back" [see Applicant's

response, page 8, line 22 & 25]. Here, Josephson ('841) indicates "payee identification

information that is printed on the check" [paragraph 34] but does not appear to limit said
information as being printed on the back of the check.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 6-12, & 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Josephson [2003/0213841]; Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 18 & 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as
being unpatentable over Josephson [2003/0213841] in view of Official Notice.

Applicant has amended Claims 3, 6, 10, & 15 to include language similar to amended
Claim 1 and contends allowability under similar grounds [Applicant's Response, page 9,
lines 12-14]. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of
the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Response to Amendments

Minor Claim Objections

Claims 1 & 6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

1. As per Claim 1, Examiner suggests that Applicant incorporate more structure into
   his/her method claim to ensure it as a statutory process. See *In re Bilski*, __ F.3d
   __ (Fed. Cir. 2008)(en banc). In line with Applicant's Specification, Examiner
   interprets "database" to be part of a "server" computer [Applicant's Specification,
   page 2, lines 18-19 & page 3, line 22, (i.e. not merely an arrangement or
   accumulation of associated data in one's mind)].

2.   As per Claim 6, Applicant should be consistent in his/her use of phrases (i.e. "the

identifying information concerning the handwritten portions of the personal

check" and "the handwritten portions of the check presented for payment "). For

instance, Applicant states "check" in lieu of "personal check" in three instances.

Next, Examiner suggests "verifying handwritten portions of a check presented for

payment" to further distinguish this phrase and align with other claims (i.e. three

instances). Lastly, Examiner suggests "honor the handwritten personal check…"

in lieu of just "honor the check..."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-1ˢᵗ & 2ⁿᵈ Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3, 10 & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention.

As per Claims 1-3, 10 & 15, Examiner was unable to find support for a "substantial" or

"substantially" matching verifying and identifying information.

Claims 1-5, 10, 12, 15 & 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per Claim 1, Applicant does not indicate how/when the identifying information is received from a payor. For instance, the information could be simultaneously received when the check is received, etc. Next, the term "substantially" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. In particular, Examiner was unable to find the term "substantially" in Applicant's Specification or Claims as originally filed (i.e. 112-1st paragraph rejection above).

As per Claims 2, 3, 10 & 15, Examiner points Applicant to the discussion in Claim 1 above regarding his/her use of "substantially" as a relative term.

As per Claim 10, Applicant should further distinguish "handwritten portions of a personal check" (i.e. stored in the database) from "handwritten portions of a personal check" (i.e. presented for payment). Applicant should make clear whether the two "personal checks" are the same or different or could be the same or different (i.e. a first personal check....a second personal check...where the first personal check is deemed the same as the first personal check if....). Of course, such modifications should have support in Applicant's Specification as filed. Further, see Examiner's maintained rejection above.

As per Claim 12, Examiner points Applicant to his maintained rejection above.

As per Claims 4, 5 & 17, said claims are rejected due to their dependence on a rejected

claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 15 & 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Canfield [5,754,653] in view of Josephson et al [2003/0213841].

As per Claim 1, Canfield ('653) teaches [a] method of preventing financial fraud concerning a

check [column 1, lines 19-20, "safeguarding depositors' accounts from forgers" & column

2, lines 14-15, "reduce fraud and misappropriation"] as follows:

First, Canfield ('653) teaches receiving, from a payor, identifying information concerning the check

[column 4, lines 25-27, "blank check" has "empty verification boxes for entry of the

verification code" & column 4, lines 28-29, "check [is] filled out by an account holder"

& column 4, lines 15-16, "verification code…is entered on the check" & column 4, lines

37-38, "check reaches the paying bank" (i.e. verification code received indirectly from

the payor)]

However, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose storing the identifying information into a

financial instrument database Regardless, Canfield ('653) does teach "[t]he bank's computer

compar[ing] the [numbers from the verification boxes] to the information *it has in*

storage for the account in order to determine the 'correctness' of the verification code"

[column 4, lines 43-46. emphasis added]. In this vein, Josephson ('841) teaches an

"authentication and identification method" in which "identification information" of a

negotiable instrument is "maintained in a computerized database" [see Abstract]. In

particular, upon presentment of said negotiable instrument, "identification information

contained within the database is recalled and compared to the identification information

contained on the [] negotiable instrument to ensure conformity" [Josephson ('841),

Abstract]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the

time of Applicant's invention, to modify Canfield ('653) to include storing the identifying

information into a financial instrument database. One would have done so to attain the

efficiency of computer systems in maintaining and/or retrieving information for quick

processing of check authorizations.

Next, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose honoring the check if verifying information

handwritten on the check by the payor substantially matches the identifying information stored in the

financial instrument database. Regardless, Examiner points Applicant to his/her evidence

presented above. (i.e. a verification code is entered on a previously blank check by a

payor, comparing of information to determine correctness/conformity with information in

a database). In this vein, Canfield ('653) teaches that "[i]f the numbers are correct, the

check is processed" [column 4, line 46]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Canfield ('653) to

include honoring the check if verifying information handwritten on the check by the

payor substantially matches the identifying information stored in the financial instrument

database. One would have done so given that a 100% match is a 'substantial' match.

Further, Canfield ('653) seeks to verify "that a check user....is authorized to complete a

transaction" [Abstract]. If verification is met, the drawee/bank would process the

directed transaction to avoid possible damages to its drawer/payor (i.e. UCC). Examiner

does not find Applicant's limitation "handwritten" as distinguishing. Surely the technical

ability exists to hand-write data in lieu of printing via machine. Merely using an old,

known technology in place of a known newer technology does not distinguish the claim if

the results are expected.

Lastly, *Applicant's claimed process likewise reads on known "signature card"*

methodologies. [see Canfield ('653), column 1, lines 22-30 generally] Here, (a) a payor

provides his signature to a bank, (b) the bank stores the identifying information in a file,

(c) the bank honors the check if the signature on the check substantially matches the

stored identifying information on file.

As per Claim 2, Canfield ('653) as modified teaches the method of Claim 1 above.

However, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose dishonoring the check if the verifying

information handwritten on the check substantially differs from the identifying information stored in the

financial instrument database. Regardless, Canfield ('653) does disclose that "[i]f the number

is incorrect...the check can be treated as a return item" [column 2, lines 48-51, i.e.

dishonored]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at

the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Canfield ('653) to include dishonoring the

check if the verifying information handwritten on the check substantially differs from the

identifying information stored in the financial instrument database. One would have

done so given that a non-match (i.e. incorrect) is 'substantially different' than a match.

Here, similar to Claim 1 above, Canfield ('653) seeks to verify "that a check user....is

authorized to complete a transaction" [Abstract]. If verification is not met, the

drawee/bank may not process the directed transaction to avoid possible losses [see

Canfield ('653), column 1, line 25-28]. Lastly, *in line with the discussion of a 'signature*

card' in Claim 1 above, a bank is likely to dishonor a check if the signature on file does

not match a presented signature to avoid losses.

As per Claim 3, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose a system comprising a

financial instrument database and a server configured to perform functions substantially similar to

Claim 1 above. Regardless, Canfield ('653) teaches its "base code" and "arithmetic

mode" (i.e. to compute the verification code) as known only by "the account holder" and

"the issuer's computer" (i.e. server) [see column 3, lines 48-50 & 54-55] where the said

computer compares given information with data in storage "to determine the 'correctness'

of the verification code" [see column 4, lines 43-46]. Under the logic and evidence as

discussed in Claim 1 above, it would have been an obvious variant to utilize a database as

part of said computer/server to store identification information [see Claim 1 above,

Josephson ('841) Abstract]. Here, to address Claim 3's further limitations, Examiner

interprets "personal" as non-functional descriptive material [i.e. A check is a draft

regardless of whether it is a personal draft, a commercial draft or otherwise and such a

further limitation is an obvious variant (e.g. simple substitute) with predictable results

(i.e. processed the same)]. Next, Canfield ('653) teaches a first source ["issuer's computer"

(column 4, line 45) through which said "verification number [] is easy for a....check

issuer to calculate" (column 2, lines 17-18) using "base code" and "arithmetic mode" and

"a variable number" (column 3, lines 48-50, 54-55 & 56) "either immediately or when

processed" (column 2, line 59)] and a second source distinct from the first source [column 4,

lines 36-42, "check [discloses] the numbers from the verification boxes"]. Here,

Examiner points Applicant to the logic and evidence of Claim 1 above for any further

limitations not explicitly discussed herein. In sum, Canfield ('653) would desire such a system to "assure that only checks with authorized signatures are paid" [column 1, lines 28-30].

As per Claims 4 & 5, Canfield ('653) as modified teaches the system of Claim 3 above. Further, Canfield ('653) teaches wherein the second source comprises the personal check presented to a financial institution for payment [see Claim 3 above]. However, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose wherein the first source comprises a payor who handwrote the verifying information on the personal check Regardless, Canfield ('653) does disclose the "verification number [as] easy…to calculate" [column 2, lines 17-18] with the "check writer" as able to calculate the "verification code" [column 3, line 65-column 4, line 16]. In particular, Canfield ('653) discloses that *only* the account holder (i.e. payor) and issuer's computer (i.e. first source as discussed in Claim 3) have critical information to compute the verification information. [see column 3, lines 48-50 & 54-55]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Canfield ('653) to include the first source as alternatively the payor who handwrote the verifying information on the personal check. Here, the payor is a simple substitute for a bank's computer given that it is the only other source which can compute a legitimate code (i.e. holds the variables to compute the verification code) and the results of such a substitution is predictable. Examiner notes that this is not unlike how positive pay systems work as known in the art (i.e. drawer as source of verification) [Josephson ('841), paragraph 7].

As per Claim 6, Examiner points Applicant to the logic and evidence as presented in substantially similar Claim 3 above. Here, to address Claim 6's slightly different limitations, Examiner interprets "personal" as non-functional descriptive material [i.e. A check is a draft regardless of whether it is a personal draft, a commercial draft or otherwise and such a further limitation is an obvious variant (e.g. simple substitute) with predictable results (i.e. processed the same)]. Similarly, Examiner does not find Applicant's limitation "handwritten" as distinguishing. Here, the technical ability exists to hand-write data in lieu of printing via machine. Merely using an old, known technology in place of a known newer technology does not distinguish the claim if the results are expected (i.e. data is printed on the check). Lastly, a computer would surely be appreciated as "a processing unit" which could be coupled to computer components including a database.

As per Claim 7, Canfield ('653) as modified teaches the apparatus of Claim 6 above. However, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose that the apparatus comprises a stand-alone system. Regardless, Josephson ('841) teaches its negotiable instrument authentication and identification system operating as "a stand alone device" [paragraph 44]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Canfield ('653) to include the apparatus as optionally a stand alone system. One would have done so to avoid having to download necessary data [see Josephson ('841), paragraph 44] in efforts to promote "immediate" comparison [Canfield ('653), column 2, line 59] for quick transactions and the reduction of non-sufficient funds risk.

As per Claim 8, Canfield ('653) as modified teaches the apparatus of Claim 6 above.

However, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose wherein the apparatus comprises a server

connected to a telecommunications network. Regardless, Josephson ('841) teaches "check

issuers...transmit[ting] their daily data files of issued checks to a central client server"

[paragraph 54] or alternatively, issuers "dowload[ing] issued check data from the check

issuer's database [directly to a teller terminal]" [paragraph 44, i.e. evidence of check

processors utilizing telecommunication networks and servers to transact business and

process data from databases]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Canfield ('653) to include

the apparatus as a server connected to a telecommunications network. One would have

been motivated to do so given that, uncontested by Applicant, one of skill in the art

would appreciate that any computer can be designated as a 'server' (i.e. including the

computer of Canfield ('653)). Further, the designation of where information is

held/processed is design choice and merely a preference of information "access" [see

Josephson ('841), paragraph 54].

As per Claim 10, Examiner points Applicant to the logic and evidence as presented in

substantially similar Claim 6 above. Here, to address Claim 10's slightly different

limitations, Examiner interprets "personal" as non-functional descriptive material [i.e. A

check is a draft regardless of whether it is a personal draft, a commercial draft or

otherwise and such a further limitation is an obvious variant (e.g. simple substitute) with

predictable results (i.e. processed the same)]. Similarly, Examiner does not find

Applicant's limitation "handwritten" as distinguishing. Here, the technical ability exists

to hand-write data in lieu of printing via machine. Merely using an old, known

technology in place of a known newer technology does not distinguish the claim if the

results are expected (i.e. data is printed on the check). Next, in line with Examiner's 112-

2nd rejection regarding Applicant's use of "means for", Examiner will assume that a

database satisfies Applicant's "means for storing..." and a *computer/server* satisfies

Applicant's "means for comparing..." said components previously discussed.

Next, Canfield (653) does not explicitly disclose a means for paying... Regardless,

Josephson ('841) discloses that "[i]f the comparison is valid, then the check's

endorsement is accepted and *consideration is given* to the payee" [paragraph 34,

emphasis added]. As such, uncontested by Applicant, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's invention, to modify Canfield ('653)

to include any known means (e.g. a teller handing payee payment, credit to payee

account, etc) for paying a financial instrument. One would have done so given that

unless a fraud is suspected, a payment order should be followed and payment tendered as

desired by the payee. Here, in line with Examiner's comment of "credit to payee

account", electronic payment via a computer/server would be appreciated in the art. [see

Josephson ('841), paragraph 38, "electronic linkage...[to] payment information"].

As per Claim 12, Canfield ('653) as modified teaches the apparatus of Claim 10 above.

Next, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose means for accessing the identifying information

stored in the database through a server connected to a global network. Regardless, Josephson ('841)

teaches the use of a "computer [] terminal" with "network connectivity" [paragraph 44].

Further, Josephson ('841) teaches that information may be on "a central client server"

[paragraph 54] and that its terminals may download said information [see paragraph 53,

Examiner asserts that network connectivity via intranet/Internet is known and would be

appreciated in view of the language "network connectivity" and "download" as used in

Josephson ('841). See also, Josephson ('841), paragraph 53, "both an off-line and on-line

modes"]. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the

time of Applicant's invention, to modify Canfield ('653) to include its computer as

capable of accessing information stored in the database through a server connected to a

global network. Josephson ('841) evidences the use of such tools (networks, servers,

databases) in the check verification art and Canfield ('653) would desire such tools to

make its process more automated (i.e. use of computers in lieu of manual file

verification), efficient (i.e. all terminals not attempting to access the same database) and

secure (i.e. avoid all information being housed in one place).

As per Claims 15 & 17, Canfield ('653) does not explicitly disclose a computer-readable

medium having instructions stored thereon to perform the methodology of the apparatus of

Claims 10 & 12 respectively. Regardless, Josephson ('841) discloses a "stand alone

device" with "the necessary programs to allow the terminal to operate" [paragraph 44, i.e.

such programs would be stored on some form of computer readable medium]. As such, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of Applicant's

invention, to modify Canfield ('653) to include a computer-readable medium with

program instructions recorded thereon to perform the methods of the apparatus as

discussed in Claims 10 & 12 above. One would have done so given, uncontested by

Applicant, the widespread use of computer-readable mediums in computers today and the

apparent ability to easily transfer programs via computer readable medium. Further,

Canfield ('653) would desire a computer readable medium to realize the functionalities of

computer instructions by a computer. Examiner refers Applicant to Claims 10 & 12

respectively above for citations regarding the methods.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to John D. Scarito whose telephone number is (571) 270-3448. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:30-5:00), Alternate F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John D. Scarito/   /Frantzy Poinvil/
Examiner, Art Unit 3696   Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696